IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1181 OF 2005

ALONG WITH

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NOS.1182/05, 1183/05,

1184/04, 1185/05, 1187/05, 1188/05,

1189/05, 1192/05 & 1193/05

Mr.Ramakant S.Pilani ...Applicant

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Anr. ...Respondents

.....

Mr.Manish Bohra i/b A.S.Khan & Associates

for Applicant.

Ms.R.M.Gadhavi, A.P.P. for Respondent No.1.

.....

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

DECEMBER 21, 2005.

P.C.

1. Heard. The grounds raised before this Court can be effectively answered by the Revisional Court.

2. As alternative efficacious remedy is available to the Applicant by way of revision in view of the decision of this Court in the case of **V.K.Jain & Ors. vs. Pratap V.Padode reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J. 778**, and unreported decision of this Court in **Criminal Writ Petition No.1023 of 2005 dated 8th December 2005 in the case of Chetan R.Nagda & Ors. vs. N.D.Pawar & Anr.**, no interference is warranted.

3. Applications are disposed of with liberty to take recourse to remedy of revision, if so advised. All questions are left open.

4. The Applicant to file such Revision Application within four weeks from today. Till such time, no precipitative action be taken against the Applicant. Revision Application, if filed within four weeks from today, be considered on its own merits in accordance with law.

5. In case, there is any delay in filing Revision Application, Court will take into account

the fact that the Applicant had first approached this Court, which period may be excused in computing delay.

6. Applications disposed of on the above terms.

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.